

Appl. No. 10/017,852
Amendment Dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 stand in this application. Claims 6-13 and 17-19 are allowed. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims.

At page 2 of the Office Action claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0023430 A1 to Srinivasan ("Srinivasan") in view of United States Patent No. 5,436,896 to Anderson ("Anderson"). Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action has failed to meet its burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. According to MPEP § 2143, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Appl. No. 10/017,852
Amendment Dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

As recited above, to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) the cited references, when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. See MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element recited in claims 1-5 and 14-16. Therefore claims 1-5 and 14-16 define over Srinivasan and Anderson whether taken alone or in combination. For example, claims 1 and 14, in relevant part, recite the following language:

providing a bridge table at said gatekeeper, said bridge table having an access number for one of said plurality of call terminals and information indicating whether said access number is also a bridge number

As correctly noted in the Office Action, Srinivasan fails to disclose, teach, or suggest that an access number is also a bridge number. The Office Action relies on Anderson to teach that that an access number is also a bridge number. Applicant respectfully disagrees. At the given cite, Anderson merely discloses that an operator may give participants a specific telephone number of the conference bridge which all of the participants may then dial at a prearranged time. Anderson, col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 2. Anderson, however, fails to disclose that a gatekeeper has a bridge table having the access number for one of the plurality of call terminals. Anderson merely discloses that the operator may give the participant a specific telephone number of the conference bridge.

Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 to recite "providing a bridge table at said gatekeeper, said bridge table having an access number for one of said

Appl. No. 10/017,852
Amendment Dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

plurality of call terminals and information indicating whether said access number is also a bridge number." Applicant respectfully submits that Srinivasan and Anderson, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest this language. Therefore, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because Srinivasan and Anderson, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element recited in claims 1-5 and 14-16.

With respect to claims 2-5 and 15-16, which depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, Applicant respectfully submits that if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. See MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Accordingly, removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 2-5 and 15-16 is respectfully requested.

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 6-13 and 17-19 are allowed.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-19 are patentable because they recite features that the cited references, fail to disclose, teach, or fairly suggest. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

It is believed that claims 1-19 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/017,852
Amendment Dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-5529 to discuss
any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Roberto Capriotti', is written over a horizontal line.

Roberto Capriotti, Reg. No. 46,599
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: May 8, 2006

4500 Brooktree Road
Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090